REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated April 5, 2011 has been received and its contents have been carefully reviewed.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0118327 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 to *Ito et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,853,841 to *St. Pierre*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,349,348 to *Anderson et al.*

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 1-13 are currently pending. No claims are amended. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0118327 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 to *Ito et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,853,841 to *St. Pierre*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,349,348 to *Anderson et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites "the decoding means does not decode the still image file during the second determination means analyzing the header of the still image file to determine whether or not the still image file is the still image file that is compressed in the decodable format." Applicant respectfully submits that the applied art, whether taken alone or in

combination, fails to disclose at least the above claimed feature. The Office acknowledges that *Um et al.* does not disclose the above feature. However, the Office relies on column 7, lines 1-5 of *St. Pierre* and column 17, lines 46-54 of *Ito et al.* for teaching the above claimed feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. *St. Pierre* at column 7, lines 1-5, merely discloses displaying an error message when a format that the device does not support is requested. Thus, *St. Pierre* does not explicitly disclose that the decoding means does not decode the still image file during the analysis of the second determination means. Further, *Ito et al.* at column 17, lines 46-54, merely discloses that the parameters necessary for JPEG demodulation is extracted by the header analysis, and the JPEG demodulation is performed using the extracted parameters. Thus, *Ito et al.* does not explicitly disclose that the decoding means does not decode the still image file during the analysis of the second determination means. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 1, as amended, is patentable over the prior art.

Independent claims 2, 6, and 10 recite similar features to claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, and 6 also are patentable over the prior art.

Furthermore, claims 3-5, 7-9, and 11-13 depend from allowable independent claims 2, 6, and 10, respectively. Applicant respectfully asserts that these dependent claims also are allowable at least because of the additional features they recite and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested, and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

By: /Haining Shu/
Haining Shu
Reg. No. L0622

Dated: June 29, 2011

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202.739.3000
Fax: 202.739.3001